



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/811,900	03/30/2004	Yi-Chia Chen	CHEN3647/EM	1317
23364 7590 09/05/2008 BACON & THOMAS, PLLC 625 SLATERS LANE FOURTH FLOOR ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314-1176				
EXAMINER BHARADWAJ, KALPANA				
ART UNIT 2129		PAPER NUMBER		
MAIL DATE 09/05/2008		DELIVERY MODE PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/811,900

Applicant(s)

CHEN ET AL.

Examiner

KALPANA BHARADWAJ

Art Unit

2129

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 13 May 2008.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-3, 5-14 and 16-23 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-3, 5-14 & 16-23 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/S508)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. This Office Action is in response to an AMENDMENT entered May 13, 2008 for the patent application 10/811,900 filed on Mar 30, 2004.
2. All prior office actions are fully incorporated into this Office Action by reference.

Status of Claims

3. Claims 1-3, 5-14 and 16-23 are pending.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 1-3, 5-14 and 16-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Flaxer (USPN 2004/0162741, referred to as **Flaxer**), and further in view of Koehler (USPN 2003/0085079, referred to as **Koehler**).

Claim 1, 12:

Flaxer teaches a method for automatic service composition, searching services from registered service specifications to find a single service or compose a service flow according to a service request, the method comprising:

a service request receiving step, for receiving a problem file established according to the service request (**Flaxer**, ¶ 0027: service requesters);

a service specification receiving step (**Flaxer**, ¶ 0028: specifications for service composition), for receiving a domain file established according to at least one service specification (**Flaxer**, ¶ 0042: hierarchy of functional domain), the at least one service specification being used for executing an action which defines an action name (**Flaxer**, ¶ 0085: operation name), zero or at least one input parameter (**Flaxer**, ¶ 0085: input ... data type), and zero or at least one output parameter (**Flaxer**, ¶ 0085: output data type), wherein any two different service specifications (**Flaxer**, ¶ 0085: define primitive services) can use an object with the same data type as the input parameter or the output parameter (**Flaxer**, ¶ 0085: input and output data type);

a new object predicting step (**Flaxer**, ¶ 0012: dynamically predict and modify), for predicting a new object by extracting data types needed by the declared objects of the problem file or the domain file (**Flaxer**, ¶ 0084: context variable ... data type) to select at least one service specification related to the data type and storing the selected service specifications in a chosen service set (**Flaxer**, ¶ 0088: service repository);

a new object declaring step (**Flaxer**, ¶ 0153: adds new tasks), for declaring the new object by counting a frequency N for each data type used (**Flaxer**, ¶ 0268: Frequency Table) as the input parameter and a frequency M for each data type used as

the output parameter in the chosen service set; if $M > 0$, the data type is also used as the output parameter, and $C \cdot \text{times} \cdot (N + M)$ new objects are declared in the domain file for the data type, wherein C is an integer (**Flaxer**, ¶ 0267-0268: For each d .epsilon the algorithm searches its data source); and

a service composition generating step, for generating a service flow (**Flaxer**, ¶ 0017: generation of new or revised decision flows) by generating a series of action execution sequences of the single service or composite service (**Flaxer**, ¶ 0013: execution of decision flow), from service specifications stored in the service repository (**Flaxer**, ¶ 0088: service repository) according to the problem file and the domain file, for being executed to accomplish the service request (**Flaxer**, ¶ 0143: accomplished by business rule inferencing).

As for the additional limitations of Claim 12, Flaxer teaches a translation layer for translating the service specification to a domain file (**Flaxer**, ¶ 0343: service ontology ... inside a domain) and also for translating a composite service to a service flow (**Flaxer**, ¶ 0082: model business processes (i.e. composite services); **EN**: to 'model' is to translate).

Flaxer teaches, wherein the service request is a file with an XML (extensible markup language) format (**Flaxer**, ¶ 0155: XML document)

Flaxer does not teach translation into a problem file with a PDDL (planning domain definition language) format via a translation process.

However, Koehler teaches translation into a problem file with a PDDL (planning domain definition language) format via a translation process (**Koehler**, ¶ 0074:

expressed in the plan representational language PDDL). Flaxer and Koehler are from the same field of endeavor, request processing. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have modified Flaxer's request processing system with PDDL, for the benefit of increased expressive power of PDDL (**Koehler**, ¶ 0074).

Claim 2, 22:

Flaxer teaches the method claimed in claim 1 further comprising: a correlation establishing step, for establishing at least one level of data-type-service graph between all service specifications and data types (**Flaxer**, ¶ 0085: service classes; data type; **EN**: The 'service class' definition correlates specifications with data types), wherein the new object predicting step follows the interactive usage correlation structure to select at least one service specification related to the data type (**Flaxer**, ¶ 0037: selects service providers).

Claim 3, 23:

Flaxer teaches the method claimed in claim 1, wherein the service request defines an initial state and a goal state and uses the series of action execution sequences to transform from the initial state to the goal state to accomplish the service request (**Flaxer**, ¶ 0046: state machine for a service composition; **EN**: a 'state machine' inherently does transformations from the initial to the goal state).

Claim 8, 14, 19:

Flaxer teaches the method claimed in claim 1, wherein the service specifications are defined by at least one service provider and are published in a service repository of a service registry (**Flaxer**, ¶ 0331: PLM Repository).

Claim 9:

Flaxer teaches the method claimed in claim 8, wherein a UDDI (universal description discovery and integration) registration protocol is used to publish the service specifications to the service registry (**Flaxer**, ¶ 0331: UDDI directory feature).

Claim 10, 20:

Flaxer teaches the method claimed in claim 1, wherein the service specification defines zero or at least one precondition (**Flaxer**, ¶ 0250: required precondition) and zero or at least one effect (**Flaxer**, ¶ 0290: process to effect).

Claim 11, 21:

Flaxer teaches the method claimed in claim 10, further comprising, after the new object declaring step, a modifying step, for adding a precondition (**Flaxer**, ¶ 0250: required precondition) and an effect to each output parameter of each service specification in the chosen service set (**Flaxer**, ¶ 0156: Event-Condition-Action) .

Claim 13:

Flaxer teaches the system claimed in claim 12, wherein the composition engine (**Flaxer**, ¶ 0082: service composition schemas) is stored with one service registry (**Flaxer**, ¶ 0310: service provider onboarding and registration).

Claim 5, 16:

Flaxer teaches the method claimed in claim 1, wherein the service specifications are files with an XML format (**Flaxer**, ¶ 0155: XML document).

Flaxer does not teach translation into a domain file with a PDDL format via a translation process.

However, Koehler teaches translation into a domain file with a PDDL format via a translation process (**Koehler**, ¶ 0074: expressed in the plan representational language PDDL).). Flaxer and Koehler are from the same field of endeavor, request processing. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have modified Flaxer's request processing system with PDDL, for the benefit of increased expressive power of PDDL (**Koehler**, ¶ 0074).

Claim 6, 17:

Flaxer modified by Koehler teaches the method claimed in claim 5, wherein a DMAL-S standard is used to define the service specifications as a file based on a RDF (resource description framework) format (**Flaxer**, ¶ 0330: XML elements; **EN**: RDF and DMAL are inherent with the use of XML).

Claim 7, 18:

Flaxer modified by Koehler teaches the method claimed in claim 5, wherein a WSDL (web services description language) standard is used to define the service specifications as a file with an XML format (**Flaxer**, ¶ 0331: defined using WSDL; ¶ 0330: XML elements).

Response to Argument

6. Applicant's arguments filed May 13, 2008 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

7. Regarding Applicant's arguments on page 1-2:

Flaxer fails to disclose a method for automatic service composition that uses a translation process to translate a service request with an XML format into a problem file with a PDDL format and to translate the service specifications with XML and RDF formats into a domain file with a PDDL format as is now positively recited in claims 1 and 12.

Examiner's response:

Applicant's amendment to claims 1 and 12 necessitated the new grounds of rejection. The above limitations are now anticipated by Flaxer and Koehler. Refer to (**Flaxer**, ¶ 0343: service ontology ... inside a domain) and (**Flaxer**, ¶ 0082: model business processes (i.e. composite services); **EN**: to 'model' is to translate). Flaxer discloses composite services, and so does the applicant. Further, Flaxer discloses the use of

XML and RDF format (**Flaxer**, ¶ 0155: XML document). PDDL is disclosed by Koehler (**Koehler**, ¶ 0074: expressed in the plan representational language PDDL. Further, PDDL is just a meta language to represent a model, and therefore translating to and from PDDL would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art.

8. Regarding Applicant's arguments on page 10-11 :

The applicant repeats the previous argument and emphasizes that both Flaxer and Koehler do not disclose any translation process to translate a service request or a service specification into a PDDL format.

Examiner's response:

The previous response applies. If an XML document is being received or output, then there is obviously a translation process underlying the system.

Examination Considerations

9. Examiner has cited particular columns and line numbers or paragraph numbers in the references applied to the claims above for the convenience of the applicant. Although the specified citations are representative of the teachings of the art and are applied to specific limitations within the individual claim, other passages and figures may apply as well. It is respectfully requested from the Applicant in preparing responses, to fully consider the references in their entirety as potentially teaching all or part of the claimed invention, as well as the context of the passage as taught by the

prior art or disclosed by the Examiner. The entire reference is considered to provide disclosure relating to the claimed invention.

Conclusion

10. Claims 1-3, 5-14 and 16-23 stand rejected.
11. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Correspondence Information

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to KALPANA BHARADWAJ whose telephone number is (571)270-1641. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 7:30am 5:00 pm EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David Vincent can be reached on (571) 272-3080. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Bharadwaj Kalpana/
Examiner, Art Unit 2129
/David R Vincent/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2129